

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are presented for further examination. Claims 1, 10, 12, 19, 26, and 29 have been amended.

In the Office Action mailed September 18, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-15, 17, 18, and 26-32 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the combination of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030110653 (“Schafer ‘653”) and U.S. Patent No. 2,230,010 (“Owens”). Claims 6, 7, 16, 19-25, and 33 have been rejected as obvious over Schafer ‘653 in view of Owens and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,971 (“Schafer ‘971”).

Applicants respectfully disagree and request reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Claim Rejections

The secondary reference relied upon by the Examiner, Owens, U.S. Patent No. 2,230,010, is directed to a Nonslide Ruler and Instrument in which a plurality of “friction strips” are applied to the flat face of an opaque ruler to prevent the ruler or instrument from slipping on a drawing surface or other flat, smooth surface. Nowhere does Owens address the problem of preventing a transparent ruler from slipping on a fabric material without interfering with seeing the underlying material through the ruler and the lines formed on the surface of the ruler.

Nowhere does Owens teach or suggest the strip being formed of “transparent” material. This is because Owens is addressing rulers that have indicia along the edge for use with measuring and marking material with a pencil (see col. 2, line 49 through col. 3, line 8 of Owens).

Nowhere does Owens teach or suggest the “friction strip” being formed of anything other than “rubber” (see col. 2, line 46). Moreover, Owens describes the rubber strip cemented or pasted to the ruler or “in any similar manner attached to the face” Owens does not contemplate or suggest using a liquid-applied material.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the use of a “transparent, non-removable *liquid-applied* coating.” As discussed above, nowhere does Owens teach or

Application No. 10/567,187
Reply to Office Action dated September 18, 2007

suggest such a coating. In addition, any combination of Schafer '653 and Owens fails to teach or suggested the combination recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 2-9 are allowable for the features recited therein as well as for the reasons why claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method of forming a ruler in which a non-removable transparent *liquid* coating is applied to a working surface of the ruler. Independent claims 12, 19, 26, and 29 all recited the use of the *liquid-applied* coating, which is not taught or suggested by Schafer or Owens, taken alone or in any combination thereof, as discussed above. All claims depending from these independent claims are allowable for the features recited therein as well as for the reasons why their respective base claims are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in this application are clearly in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicant's undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/
E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jk

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1132060_1.DOC